

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD**

Meeting of May 3, 2007

Members in Attendance

David Dowling, Chairman
Sara Jane Cate, Vice Chairperson
Jeffrey Staub
Greg Sirb
Alan Hansen

Also in Attendance

James Turner, Solicitor
Lori Wissler, Planning & Zoning Officer

Special Exception #07-01

Applicant:	Carmel A. Biko, Trust
Address:	2205 Forest Hills Drive, Suite 10, Harrisburg, PA
Property:	North Side of Linglestown Road, between Colonial Road and Patton Road Tax Parcel #35-009-158
Interpretation:	Shared parking requires a special exception. Applicant proposes a reduction of 30 parking spaces.
Grounds:	Article 602.F of the Lower Paxton Township Codified Ordinances pertains to this application.

Mr. Dowling recused himself for a conflict of interest, and turned the meeting over to Vice-Chairperson Cate.

The following were sworn in: George Lenhart, 502 Leward Lane, Enola, PA; Carmel Biko, 2409 West Bayberry Drive, Harrisburg, PA; Craig Bachik, Kairos Design Group, 4 Lemoyne Drive, Suite 210, Lemoyne, PA; and Lori Wissler, Planning and Zoning Officer.

The applicant had no objection to entering the application and site plans and attachments as exhibits.

Fees for this application were paid on April 2, 2007. Proper advertisements were made in the Paxton Herald on April 18 and 25, 2007. The property was posted April 24, 2007. Article 602.F pertains to this application: Reduction of parking requirements is a special exception and the Zoning Hearing Board may authorize the reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces required to be provided for a use if the applicant

proves to the satisfaction of the Board that a lesser number of spaces will be sufficient. They are required to provide 457 spaces, and they are proposing 427, including 30 shared spaces.

Mr. Bachik stated that the applicant is currently going through the land development process for LenMaur Plaza. The development consists of three buildings and four uses. The main entrance is off Linglestown Road. The Weis Market is on the left, the newly constructed Dunkin Donuts is to the right on the plan. The proposal is for a very upscale restaurant with presentation to Linglestown Road. It is a permitted use in this zoning district. The restaurant totals 31,000 square feet, comprised of the upscale restaurant at grade with Linglestown Road with valet parking taking the cars to the perimeter parking areas, and a more casual dining experience on the lower level with a rear patio and an interior bar space. The two restaurants will have a total of 587 seats, and a staff of about 40 employees.

Mr. Bachik stated that the restaurant requires 376 parking spaces. Both restaurants will be unique to this area. The upper restaurant will most likely open at 4:00 pm with a closing time at 10:00 pm. The lower restaurant will operate from 11:00 am until 2:00 am. These are two compatible uses with two different types of clientele.

Mr. Bachik stated that there will be a day spa with about 6,419 square feet. It will be a Paul Mitchell type spa. It is intended to be a stand alone facility which will require 40 parking spaces.

Mr. Bachik stated that the entire site is about 9 acres with a drainage-way and wetlands in the middle of it. They have worked extensively to plan for plantings to complement that area. There will be a terraced parking area. The office building will be the corporate headquarters for the owner of all three buildings. This is not a typical development; it is intended to be a signature campus for the developer.

The two-story office building will be about 12,000 square feet and will require 41 parking spaces. The parking field is well in excess of 41, and is intended to be the valet parking for the restaurant. The office hours will be approximately 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, with peak activity between 10:00 am and 2:00 pm. Since the office will close at 5:00 pm and the restaurant will begin its peak activity around 5:00 pm, it makes sense to consider shared parking on the site.

Mr. Bachik stated that at the Planning Commission meeting, there was an interest from some adjoining property owners regarding parking and screening. After that meeting, he met with a number of neighbors and have agreed to provide a fence along the entire rear portion of the property. That is not a requirement of the ordinance, but is being offered to address their concerns in an attempt to be a good neighbor. The fence will be eight feet high and beige in color as requested by the neighbors. There will also be the screen planting as well.

Ms. Cate asked when the restaurant will be built. Mr. Bachik stated they hope to begin construction this year, when the appropriate approvals and permits have been obtained.

Ms. Cate asked if the valet parking is for the upper level restaurant only. Mr. Bachik answered that it is, and the lower restaurant will be self-parked.

Mr. Hansen asked the current location of the corporate offices. Ms. Biko stated it is in Forest Hills. Mr. Hansen asked how the square footage was determined. Mr. Bachik stated it is not based on numbers of people, but more on the availability of the site.

Mr. Hansen asked how the square footage of the restaurant was determined. Mr. Bachik stated it is based on the dream and vision of the facility to create something that is very unique and a one of a kind experience. Both restaurants will be unique and do not compare to any around the area.

Mr. Hansen asked the days of operation for both restaurants. Mr. Bachik stated they will operate seven days a week.

Mr. Hansen asked the days of operation for the office building. Mr. Lenhart answered typically Monday through Friday with a possibility of overtime.

Mr. Bachik stated that the 41 space requirement for the office is very generous and should never need all of those. He also stated that it will be highly unlikely that all 587 seats will be occupied all the time.

Ms. Cate asked about the possibility of leasing some of the office space, should the developer not need it all. Mr. Bachik stated this plan is very personal, and there is no intention of leasing the space. Ms. Cate asked if it has been determined that they will not lease space to anyone else. Mr. Bachik stated he could not answer that it will never be leased, but there are no intentions to lease space out.

Mr. Sirb asked when the tract was changed from R-1 to CN. Ms. Wissler stated the land has always been commercial, but in July 2006 it was changed from C-1 to the CN, Neighborhood Commercial District. Mr. Sirb asked if there would still be a possibility of shared spaces if the land were zoned R-1. Ms. Wissler stated the land was never R-1, and there was no concept of shared parking in the previous zoning ordinance. They would have been required to get a variance for a lesser number of parking spaces.

Mr. Sirb asked the number of employees to be housed in the office building. Mr. Lenhart stated the developer has a total of 37 employees that are spread across several buildings. Mr. Sirb asked if all 37 will be relocated to this facility, and if not, how many

will be located in this facility. Mr. Lenhart stated there will be less than 20 people working in this building, and the others will remain at the other locations, such as the limousine company in Swatara Township, and the landscaping company.

Mr. Sirb asked if the parking spaces will be designated for office versus restaurant parking. Mr. Bachik stated that the designation will be for the valet parking, in that the valets will be instructed where the vehicles are to be parked.

Ms. Cate asked the hours of the day spa. Mr. Bachik stated they will be open from 8:00 am until 5:00 pm or 9:00 pm.

Mr. Staub stated that the Special Exception plan shows 376 dedicated restaurant parking spaces, but the application says 346 dedicated spaces for the restaurant, and if you add all the numbers in the legend, it comes out to 457 spaces and only 427 spaces are needed. Mr. Staub asked the applicant to work out the math discrepancies and forward a revised plan to the Township Zoning Officer.

Mr. Bachik stated that 427 spaces is the accurate number. There should be 346 dedicated spaces, plus 30 shared spaces.

Mr. Staub questioned the parking calculations for the day spa. Mr. Staub asked if there will be a beauty salon and barber shop in the day spa. Mr. Bachik stated the intent of the spa is to include all aspects of pampering, from massages to hair cuts. Mr. Staub stated a building of that size is disproportionate to the number of employees; seven employees do not seem to be enough. Mr. Staub stated it was important to consider since there is a request for lesser parking.

Mr. Staub questioned the parking calculations for the restaurant, and the figures of 31,000 square feet with only 587 seats. A Texas Roadhouse or Macaroni Grill is about 5,000 to 7,000 square feet with a minimum of 200 seats. There should be enough room for 1,000 seats in this proposed facility. Mr. Staub was concerned that the restaurant will inevitably be sold in the future, and may not be the same type of venue.

Mr. Lenhart stated that the wine room itself will be the size of a Texas Roadhouse. Mr. Bachik stated that the preparation room for the type of upscale food will also be larger than typical around this area. There will be rooms available for groups from 5-20 people that are not in the normal dining area. It is intended to be a much more spacious dining experience. Mr. Lenhart compared the restaurant to Ruth Chris in Philadelphia and Washington.

Mr. Turner was concerned that if the Special Exception was granted, there needs to be some protection from future owners. Mr. Turner suggested restricting the number of seats allowed at any time. It makes sense to tie the number of seats to the decision, but that may affect the future marketability. That restriction will carry forward to any future

restaurant use on this tract. There could only be 587 seats unless the parking were increased. Increasing the seating may mean adding decked parking because there would not be room for another 100 or 200 spaces on the site. Mr. Bachik stated that there is only a question of 30 spaces, not hundreds, and the 30 spaces could be added to the site by giving up green space. Mr. Turner clarified that the 30 shared spaces are based on the proposed seating, but the square footage of the site would not nearly accommodate the potential seating in the restaurants.

Mr. Bachik agreed that it would be appropriate to attach conditions to the decision. They believe that sharing 30 parking spaces is legitimate for what this developer wants to do with the site.

Mr. Bachik stated that the narrative is accurate for numbers of spaces. He also felt that the requirement of one space for every two seats was very conservative. Mr. Turner stated that every developer says the requirement is too conservative, but the builder always tells the Township it needs twice as much parking as required.

Mr. Bachik noted that the Planning Commission did forward a favorable recommendation with regard to this application.

Mr. Sirb noted that the top purple section of the drawing should say 79 spaces, not 109 spaces, because it was double counted.

Mr. Sirb stated he liked the concept, but could see the day spa parking being used for the parking for the restaurant. Mr. Sirb suggested not having the day spa at all, as it seems to be an odd fit. Mr. Lenhart explained that they also own a Paul Mitchell school at a different location, so the day spa is intended to compliment that school.

Ms. Cate asked how many people would work in a day spa of that size. Mr. Bachik stated that there will be seven employees. Ms. Cate asked if that is to include beauticians, manicurists, shampoo persons, et cetera and noted that seven does not seem like enough. Mr. Bachik stated that the day spa is intended to be a stand alone facility and is not part of the Special Exception request.

Mr. Bachik noted that reality is that the Weis parking lot will probably be used by customers, but noted that they do not have nor do they wish to pursue an agreement with Weis for parking.

Mr. Staub noted that permitting with DEP is very difficult, and asked the status of the two wetland encroachments. Mr. Bachik stated there is no encroachment, and they have applied for general permits for the crossings. They have received an adequacy letter. The crossings span the wetlands and the applicant will not disturb the wetlands in any way.

Mr. Sirb asked how many parking spaces are required for the day spa. Ms. Wissler noted that the day spa is in the category for personal services, and require one space for every 200 square feet of floor area, plus one for each employee. Mr. Sirb calculated 32 spaces required for the square footage, plus seven employees for a total of 39 spaces, and 40 spaces are provided.

Mr. Staub asked about Section 602.F.2.C and if that means that the Zoning Hearing Board can require that the reduced parking be planned for elsewhere on the lot should it be needed in the future. Mr. Staub asked if that is just an option or a requirement. Ms. Wissler stated that the Board may require it of the applicant.

Mr. Staub asked if the applicant is close to the maximum impervious coverage on the site. Mr. Bachik answered no. Mr. Staub noted that with the size of the project, what is 30 more spaces. Mr. Bachik stated that each space is 10x20, which amounts to a lot of green space, and they do not feel it is necessary to get rid of it. They want to plant the area, not park it. Mr. Bachik noted that 587 seats is a lot of seats, and reality is that they will not be filled every night. The office will not be parked all day and all night, it will be partially parked from 8am to 5pm. Mr. Bachik stated they could possibly create parking all over the site, including in front of the restaurant and all around the day spa, creating a lot of impervious coverage, but it just does not make sense. They feel they can have a very green appearance and still get the cars parked in the site.

Mr. Staub noted that one or two parking spaces in the front of the restaurant is within the 30 foot setback. Mr. Bachik stated it is from the pavement. Mr. Staub stated that 20 feet of that has to be green space.

Mr. Staub asked if there is any intention of talking to Weis Markets about using their parking lot. Mr. Sirb stated that the big empty lot is such an obvious place for parking.

Mr. Bachik stated they do not feel they need the parking. Mr. Sirb stated they do need the parking or they would not be before the Board. Mr. Bachik stated that the concept is to not create another big empty parking lot. Mr. Sirb agreed with the concept, noting it was well done and well thought out, but there is an empty lot right next door begging to be used. Mr. Bachik stated they do not own those spaces. Ms. Cate asked if something could be worked out.

Mr. Lenhart stated they thought about using that parking in the beginning stages, and did reach out to Weis but got no response.

Mr. Sirb stated he can guarantee that if the businesses do well, the customers will park at Weis and walk to the restaurant, and noted that they do that now for Kokomo's.

Mr. Sirb stated that the application is not unreasonable.

Mr. Hansen asked why the plan looks like there is a roadway going to the Weis parking lot. Mr. Bachik stated there are cross access easements. The original subdivision that created the three lots included cross access easements for all three properties to limit access to Linglestown Road.

Mr. Hansen stated that people could and probably will use Weis to get to the restaurant. Mr. Bachik agreed. Mr. Staub stated that if you travel eastbound on Linglestown Road you have to use one of the easements to get to the restaurant. Mr. Bachik stated that is not true, PennDOT is allowing a left turn into the site.

Ms. Wissler stated that the original plan called for all three lots to use the side streets and no accesses to Linglestown Road. Mr. Bachik stated that an access was planned for at the property line of Weis and this lot. Ms. Wissler noted that the legal issues regarding this plan must be worked out before the plan goes forward.

Ms. Cate called for comment from the audience.

Marsha Greise, 2402 Patton Road, was sworn in. Her home is behind the subject parcel. Ms. Greise asked about the parking that will be needed for the employees for the restaurants. Ms. Greise owns a restaurant and asked about the clientele of the proposed casual restaurant which is open later. Ms. Cate stated there was testimony that there will be 40 employees. Mr. Lenhart stated that is correct. Mr. Lenhart stated it will not be typical Kokomo's customers, because they would clash with the intentions of the entire site.

Mr. Brad Henken, 4425 Venus Avenue, was sworn in. His property is adjacent to the Pinnacle Family Medicine Center, next to this property. Mr. Henken thanked the applicant and noted that they met with him to discuss the parking issues. Mr. Henken stated that they have a gentlemen's agreement that they will use the office parking for valet parking, which eased the neighbors concerns. No matter what type of person it is normally, at 2am they tend to be loud during their goodbyes in the parking lot. Mr. Henken was told by the applicant that they would set the rear parking aside for valet parking to try to control it. He asked how that would apply to a future owner so that that next owner does not allow general parking in the area closest to the residents. Ms. Cate agreed and asked how they will preserve that area for valet parking. Mr. Bachik stated it is a matter of convenience, that a person coming to the restaurant will not park way in the back if there are spaces available closer. Mr. Lenhart suggested the rear parking area could be chained. Mr. Bachik and Mr. Sirb agreed that securing the rear lot is a good idea. Mr. Henken noted that he has no concerns with the current owner and their intentions, but was concerned with the future.

Mr. Bachik noted that they are working with the neighbors and trying to address their concerns. He noted that a restaurant is a permitted use directly adjacent to the

neighbors property lines, and it could happen without ever coming before the Zoning Hearing Board. The office use is proposed in the rear of the site, and thus provides a greater buffer for the residents from the restaurant's activity.

Mr. Bachik addressed the comment about the parking setbacks along Linglestown Road. Mr. Bachik stated that Section 603.H.2 states that a planting strip shall have minimum width of 30 feet, be maintained of grass and other attractive vegetative ground cover, at least 20 feet of the planting strip shall be outside the existing right-of-way. The plan is compliant with that requirement.

Mr. Sirb's concern is that the 30 spaces are available on the site, and a compromise could be to downsize the office or the spa, and there would be no need for a Special Exception. He felt that 30 spaces is a little too much, and 5-7 shared spaces would be more reasonable.

Danielle Nguyen, 4423 Venus Avenue, noted that the property where she lives is owned by Paul Buchta and is shown on the plan. They have a shared tree at the edge of the property and asked for clarification on who owns it. The property stake goes to the exact middle of the tree. Ms. Biko asked if Ms. Nguyen wanted the tree. Ms. Nguyen answered no. Mr. Bachik stated that if it is on the property line there is shared responsibility, but offered to let Ms. Nguyen chose whether the applicant left the tree standing or not. Ms. Nguyen did not want the tree and thanked the applicant for everything that they have done. Ms. Biko asked Ms. Nguyen to mark the tree, and she will have it taken down.

The Township had no position with regard to this application.

Mr. Lenhart noted that the lighting, walking paths, bridges, restaurant, spa and the office will be designed so that it is a signature campus and to be very attractive, far beyond the normal. It is very environmentally friendly and they do not want to pave more than is necessary.

Mr. Henken noted that the plan presented is so much nicer than the neighboring development, which is an eyesore, and he appreciates the extra effort put forth by this applicant.

Mr. Staub noted that the plan does not meet the 20 foot buffer requirement between the parking lot and Linglestown Road.

Mr. Sirb asked if there was anyone in the audience who objects to what has been presented. There was no response from the audience. Mr. Henken noted that this is the lesser of many evils, and the land is commercially zoned, so something will be developed. If something has to go there, this plan sounds much more appealing than other things.

Mr. Sirb asked if the decision can be tied to restrict the land for future owners. Mr. Turner stated that should this be granted, the decision can be tied to hours of operation, or number of seats. Mr. Sirb asked if one of the neighbors suspected the place was too crowded and complained to the Township, if the township would inspect the site. Ms. Wissler noted that the problem is that there is so much floor space that another owner will cram in more tables. Ms. Wissler stated that the moment the inspection is over, they can put the additional tables out. She noted she has witnessed another location do exactly that.

Mr. Bachik agreed that the decision could be tied to seating, and if there were to be an increase in seats, it would be easily apparent in the parking.

Mr. Turner stated that tying the decision to the number of seats is perfectly appropriate and should be part of the decision. The problem is the potential for a building of this size, without regard to the 30 shared spaces.

Mr. Staub asked if it is appropriate to include a condition for securing the northern parking lot at a specific time.

Ms. Greise noted that a customer could have had valet parking when he had dinner at the upper restaurant and then decided to continue the night at the lower restaurant. She asked if the valets will move the car from the valet lot. Ms. Biko stated that the valets will move the remaining cars close to the restaurant when it came time to secure that lot.

Mr. Sirb made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the conditions as follows: the Special Exception is tied directly to the number of seats in the restaurant, which is 587 seats; and the upper part of the parking that is to be used as valet parking surrounding the office building shall be closed and cars removed before 11:00 pm. Mr. Staub seconded the motion. Ms. Cate called for discussion on the motion. Mr. Staub stated that because this property will be sold at some point in the future, it is prudent to invoke the section of the ordinance requiring the reservation of a future parking area for those 30 spaces. Mr. Sirb concurred. Mr. Sirb asked when the property is sold, if the additional 30 spaces have to be installed or come back to the Zoning Hearing Board for the Exception. Mr. Turner stated the Special Exception would continue on unless the conditions of the Special Exception are not met, they would then have to put the 30 spaces in. Mr. Sirb amended the motion to include the above amendment. The applicant understood and was agreeable to the motion.

Special Exception #07-01 was granted with a role call vote: Mr. Hansen-No; Mr. Staub-Aye; Mr. Sirb-Aye; Ms. Cate-Aye.

The hearing ended at 8:26 pm.

Docket # 1229

Applicant:	Subhas Mazumdar c/o DWH22 Associates Architect acting on behalf of the owner
Address:	422 Washington Avenue, Media, PA 19063
Property:	4342 Linglestown Road, Harrisburg, PA Dunkin Donuts/Baskin Robbins
Interpretation:	One freestanding sign is permitted per public frontage. Applicant proposes a second freestanding sign that exceeds the allowable maximum sign area.
Grounds:	Section 714.A. of the Lower Paxton Township Codified Ordinances pertains to this application.

The following were sworn in: Brian Evans, Evans Engineering, 2793 Old Post Road, Harrisburg, PA; Shilpa Patel, owner of the property; and Lori Wissler, Lower Paxton Township Planning and Zoning Officer.

Mr. Evans explained that he is a civil engineer, and he works with Mr. Mazumdar who is the architect for the project.

Ms. Wissler testified that the appropriate fees were paid on April 2, 2007. Proper advertisements were made in the Paxton Herald on April 18 and 25, 2007. The property was posted on April 24, 2007.

Ms. Wissler testified that Section 714.A. of the Lower Paxton Township Codified Ordinances, Free Standing Signs, pertains to this variance application.

Mr. Evans stated that the Dunkin Donuts/Baskin Robbins has recently opened and is allowed one free standing sign. The restaurant has a drive-thru, and like any other drive-thru needs a menu board. The ordinance recognizes the menu board as a free standing sign.

Mr. Dowling asked if the sign is in place now. Mr. Evans answered yes, and noted that the drive-thru cannot operate without it. This restaurant cannot use the typical Dunkin Donuts/Baskin Robbins ground sign at this location, so they are asking for a freestanding sign to identify the restaurant so that it can be seen by cars traveling Linglestown Road, in addition to the menu board.

Mr. Staub stated he does not want to allow an additional free standing sign on Linglestown Road. He suggested that the applicant attach the menu board to the building, since the building is within a foot of where the sign is currently. Mr. Dowling asked if the menu board is visible from Linglestown Road. Mr. Evans answered no.

Mr. Evans asked if they kept the menu board as it is now on a pole in the ground, and found a way to mechanically attach it to the building, if that would satisfy the Board. Mr. Staub stated that would satisfy him. Mr. Sirb wanted the sign removed and attached to the building, he did not want a pole run from the sign across to the building. That would not satisfy Mr. Sirb. Mr. Staub stated he should make it a wall sign. Mr. Evans asked if that meant flush-mounting it to the cooler structure that is there now, and if it could be tilted so the customers can see it.

Mr. Dowling asked how close the sign is to the building. Mr. Staub stated it is about a foot away.

Ms. Cate questioned the need for signage, noting there is a sign on the west side of the building, on the front of the building, and everybody knows what a Dunkin Donuts/Baskin Robbins looks like by the building itself. She asked why they need another sign, and asked if they would be willing to remove the sign on the west side of the building. Mr. Evans stated that a vehicle cannot see the signs until it is almost to the building because of the trees and vegetation. Ms. Cate stated that is about to change with the day spa going in next door. Mr. Evans understood that it will be removed over time.

Ms. Cate stated that people do not drive down the road looking up in the air, they look straight ahead and that is why a ground sign makes more sense to her than the building sign. Ms. Cate recommended that they remove the wall sign and install the ground sign because of that.

Mr. Evans stated that there are franchise contract requirements with Dunkin Donuts. They may say she must have certain signs regardless if she agrees with the Zoning Hearing Board or not.

Mr. Turner asked Ms. Wissler if the sign is mounted on the wall, will there be an issue with the wall sign regulations that might require a variance. Ms. Wissler stated that a wall sign can be 10% of that wall. She needed to know the dimensions of the wall, but speculated it would probably be okay. Mr. Evans assumed that it is less than 10%. Mr. Turner asked if there would be an issue with the number of wall signs for the building. Ms. Wissler stated that one of them would have to come down, wall signs are limited to two sides of the building. Mr. Turner stated that if the menu board is mounted to the wall, they would have to remove a wall sign or obtain a variance for number of wall signs.

Mr. Dowling was fine with the menu board and a small monument sign. He noted that the Board makes decisions on a case by case basis and there is no concern with setting precedence. Mr. Dowling noted that he liked that the menu board is not visible from Linglestown Road. Ms. Cate stated it is visible and she has driven by and seen it. Mr. Evans stated that the original design called for the sign to be in the rear, where it was installed. Then Corporate came in and repositioned the sign to where it is now.

Mr. Turner stated that the testimony is that the sign is presently located on the east side of the building, not on the north side of the building.

Mr. Dowling asked if Corporate requires a free standing monument sign. Mr. Evans answered yes. Ms. Cate asked if Corporate requires the two wall signs. Ms. Patel thought there had to be two signs, but would verify that with them. Ms. Cate noted that a ground sign and a wall sign is still two signs.

Mr. Hansen asked what the monument sign will look like. Mr. Evans stated that the sign area will be about 50 square feet, and will sit on a 2-foot high pedestal. It will be 7' 6" high by 6' 8" wide, and 2 feet off the ground.

Ms. Cate felt the ground sign should be permitted if one wall sign is removed from the west side of the building.

The Board took a recess from 8:43 pm to 8:47 pm to allow the applicant to discuss the signage.

Ms. Patel stated she called her representative and he told her it is okay to remove the sign on the west side if they can keep the menu board as it is. Mr. Evans stated the variance request would then be to allow the ground sign since they are removing overall sign square footage.

There was no comment from the audience.

There was no comment from the Township.

Ms. Cate made a motion to grant the request for a ground sign based on Ms. Patel removing the sign on the west side of the building near the top. Mr. Sirb seconded the motion and a role call vote was as follows: Mr. Hansen-Aye; Mr. Staub-Aye; Mr. Sirb-Aye; Ms. Cate-Aye, and Mr. Dowling-Aye.

The hearing ended at 8:49 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lower Paxton Township
Zoning Hearing Board
May 3, 2007
Page 13 of 13

Michelle Hiner
Recording Secretary